



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 10/776,513 | 02/12/2004 | Kalle Tammi | 47092.00073 | 3671 |
| 32294 | 7590 | 09/03/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212 | | | | NAJEE-Ullah, TARIQ S |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | 2152 | | |
| | | MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | 09/03/2008 | | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/776,513 | TAMMI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH | 2152 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 8-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action has been issued in response to Applicant's Amendment filed May 20, 2008. Claims 1-6 and 8-36 are pending in the case. Claims 1-6, 8, and 11-17 have been amended. Claim 7 has been cancelled. New claims 18-36 have been added.
2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office Action. Therefore, applicant's arguments relating to the cited references in the rejections of claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. The objection to the specification due to informalities is withdrawn.
4. Regarding the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b), Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office Action. Therefore, Applicant's arguments relating to the cited references in the rejections of claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6 and 8-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over “3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS); Stage 2 (Release 5)” 3GPP TS 23.228 V6.0.0, January 2003 (2003-01), pages 1-128, XP-002279519 from Applicant’s IDS submitted on 16 December, 2004 (3GPP hereinafter) in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0194336 to Kett et al (Kett hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1, 8, 20, 25, 32 and 34-36, 3GPP teaches **a method of deactivating a service account associated with an application server of a registered subscriber within a signaling network supporting internet protocol based services, the method comprising: monitoring a status of a service account** (Pg. 43, sec. 5.3.2.2.2, line 1; “A service platform may determine a need to clear a user’s SIP registration.”); **forwarding a request for de-registration from said application server via a direct interface to a registration server, which maintains a registration status of said subscriber** (pg. 43, fig. 5.5a; a deregistration request is forwarded from the service platform to the S-CSCF, P-CSCF, UE AND finally to the HSS, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber.), **upon determining that disruption or termination of service is required** (Pg. 43, sec. 5.3.2.2.2, line 1; “A service platform may determine a need to clear a user’s SIP registration,” i.e. reason for the disruption or termination of service.); **and changing the registration status of said subscriber so as to de-register said subscriber at said registration server in response to said de-registration request** (pg. 41, step 3 and

pg. 44, step 6; based on the operator choice, the S-CSCF can change the registration status from registered to unregistered.).

3GPP does not explicitly teach connecting from an application server to a registration server **via a direct interface**. Kett teaches **via a direct interface** (fig. 4, 4.1; pg. 2, par. 30-33). Kett and 3GPP are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of network communication. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Kett's direct interface connection with 3GPP's IP Multimedia Subsystem. The suggestion/motivation would have been to improve the function and performance of API implementation in a communication network (Kett, pg. 1, par. 15-17).

Regarding claims 2, 18 and 21 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 1, 11 and 20 including, **wherein said forwarding step comprises forwarding said request** (pg. 43, fig. 5.5a; a deregistration request is forwarded from the service platform to the S-CSCF, P-CSCF, UE AND finally to the HSS i.e. registration server, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber.) **over said interface directly coupling said application server and said registration server** (Pg. 14-17, sec. 4.2.4 details the interface between the S-CSCS, application server, and the HSS i.e. registration server.).

Regarding claims 3,12, 22 and 28 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 1 , 11, 20 and 27 including, **wherein said forwarding comprises forwarding said request to said registration server comprising a home subscriber server of an internet protocol multimedia**

subsystem (pg. 43, fig. 5.5a; a deregistration request is forwarded from the service platform to the S-CSCF, P-CSCF, UE AND finally to the HSS i.e. home subscriber server, i.e. registration server, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber. Pg. 14-17, sec. 4.2.4 details the interface between the S-CSCS, application server, and the HSS i.e. registration server.).

Regarding claims 4, 19 and 23 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 3, 12 and 22 above including, **wherein said forwarding comprises forwarding said request over said interface comprising an Sh reference point** (pg. 43, fig. 5.5a; a deregistration request is forwarded from the service platform to the S-CSCF, P-CSCF, UE AND finally to the HSS i.e. home subscriber server, i.e. registration server, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber. Pg. 16-17, sec. 4.2.4a details the interface comprising a Sh interface).

Regarding claims 5, 13, 24 and 29, 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 3, 12, 22 and 28 above including, **wherein said forwarding comprises forwarding said request in a profile update request command** (pg. 44, step 6; S-CSCF sends an update to the HSS to remove itself as the registered S-CSCF for this user.).

Regarding claims 6 and 26, 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 5 and 25 above including, **further comprising indicating de-registration by setting an updated registration status to a predetermined value** (pg. 39, sec. 5.3.1, par. 1; “De-registration is accomplished by a registration with an expiration time of zero seconds”, i.e. a predetermined value.).

Regarding claims 9 and 33, 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 8 and 32 above including, **wherein said registration server is a home subscriber server** (pg. 43, fig. 5.5a; a deregistration request is forwarded from the service platform to the S-CSCF, P-CSCF, UE AND finally to the HSS i.e. home subscriber server, i.e. registration server, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber. Pg. 14-17, sec. 4.2.4 details the interface between the S-CSCS, application server, and the HSS i.e. registration server.).

Regarding claims 10, 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 8 above including, **wherein said signaling network comprises an internet protocol multimedia subsystem** (pg. 43, sec. 5.3.2.2.2, fig. 5.5a; the flow diagram shows a service control initiated Internet protocol Multimedia Subsystem terminal application.).

Regarding claims 11, 16-17 and 27, 3GPP teaches **a method of deactivating a service account associated with an application server of a registered subscriber within a signaling network supporting internet protocol based services, the method comprising: monitoring a status of said service account** (Pg. 43, sec. 5.3.2.2.2, line 1; “A service platform may determine a need to clear a user’s SIP registration.”); **forwarding a request for barring from said application server via a direct interface to a registration server, which maintains a registration status of said subscriber** (pg. 43, fig. 5.5a; a deregistration request is forwarded from the service platform to the S-CSCF, P-CSCF, UE AND finally to the HSS, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber.), **upon determining that**

disruption or termination of service is required (Pg. 43, sec. 5.3.2.2.2, line 1; “A service platform may determine a need to clear a user’s SIP registration,” i.e. reason for the disruption or termination of service.); **and changing a barring indication of said subscriber so as to bar said subscriber at said registration server by changing said barring indication in response to said barring request** (pg. 41, step 3 and pg. 44, step 6; based on the operator choice, the S-CSCF can change the registration status from registered to unregistered.).

3GPP does not explicitly teach connecting from an application server to a registration server **via a direct interface**. Kett teaches **via a direct interface** (fig. 4, 4.1; pg. 2, par. 30-33). Kett and 3GPP are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of network communication. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Kett’s direct interface connection with 3GPP’s IP Multimedia Subsystem. The suggestion/motivation would have been to improve the function and performance of API implementation in a communication network (Kett, pg. 1, par. 15-17).

Regarding claims 14 and 31, 3GPP-Kett discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 13 and 30 above including, **further comprising indicating barring by adding the barring indication to a definition of a public identity** (Pg. 33, sec. 5.2.1, step 7; the HSS supports the barring of public user identity.).

Regarding claims 15 and 30, 3GPP **teaches a system for deactivating a service account of a registered subscriber within a signaling network supporting internet protocol based services, said system comprising: a registration server**

configured to maintain a registration status of said subscriber (Pg. 41, sec. 5.3.2, heading: subscription management; the network manages the subscriber's access to the network based on the current registration status. The HSS maintains registration information.); **and an application server, to which said service account is associated** (Pg. 14-17, sec. 4.2.4 details the interface between the S-CSCF, application server, and the HSS i.e. registration server.), **configured to monitor a status of said service account** (Pg. 43, sec. 5.3.2.2.2, line 1; “A service platform may determine a need to clear a user’s SIP registration.”) **and to forward via a direct interface a request for barring to said registration server** (pg. 43, fig. 5.5a; a deregistration request is forwarded from the service platform to the S-CSCF, P-CSCF, UE AND finally to the HSS, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber, and the S-CSCF. Pg. 35, fig. 5.1, a registration request is forwarded from the UE the P-CSCF, I-CSCF, HSS, which contains the registration information of the user i.e. subscriber, and the S-CSCF. Pg. 26, S-CSCFs reject IMS communication to/from public user identities that are barred from IMS communication after completion of registrations.), **upon determining that disruption or termination of service is required** (Pg. 43, sec. 5.3.2.2.2, line 1; “A service platform may determine a need to clear a user’s SIP registration,” i.e. reason for the disruption or termination of service.), **wherein said registration server is configured to change a barring indication of said subscriber to bar said subscriber in response to said barring request** (pg. 33, sec. 5.2.1a, step 4; when one of the public user identities within the de-registered, all public user identities that have been implicitly registered are de-registered at the same

time. Pg. 41, step 3 and pg. 44, step 6; based on the operator choice, the S-CSCF can change the registration status from registered to unregistered.).

3GPP does not explicitly teach connecting from an application server to a registration server **via a direct interface**. Kett teaches **via a direct interface** (fig. 4, 4.1; pg. 2, par. 30-33). Kett and 3GPP are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of network communication. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Kett's direct interface connection with 3GPP's IP Multimedia Subsystem. The suggestion/motivation would have been to improve the function and performance of API implementation in a communication network (Kett, pg. 1, par. 15-17).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US 2003/0140131 to Chandrashekhar et al.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TARIQ S. NAJEE-ULLAH whose telephone number is (571)270-5013. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 - 5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152